UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,382	06/20/2003	Brian J. Cragun	ROC920030127US1	8521

46797   7590   04/18/2012
IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
HICKS, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/18/2012	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

_____

Ex parte BRIAN J. CRAGUN, JULIA E. RICE, PETER M. SCHWARZ,
WILLIAM C. SWOPE, and HOA T. TRAN

_____

Appeal 2010-002397
Application 10/600,382
Technology Center 2100

_____

Before THOMAS S. HAHN, DENISE M. POTHIER, and GLENN J.
PERRY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PERRY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's
rejection of claims 10, 13, 14, 22 and 28. We have jurisdiction under 35
U.S.C. § 6(b). We reverse.

                    STATEMENT OF THE CASE

        Appellants' invention provides an expedient way to index annotations
made to different types of data objects. A set of parameters uniquely
identifying an annotated data object is converted to an index formed from a
set of index values, each index value corresponding to a column of a
homogeneous index table. In order to index heterogeneous data objects
using the same format index for all data objects, a mapping is provided for
each different type of data object. The mapping for a particular data object
type defines how identifying parameters for that object type will be mapped
to the columns of the index table. The invention addresses the problem of
creating index entries for different types of documents that will all be listed
in the same index of a database. *See* generally Abstract, Background and
Summary.

        Appellants argued independent claims 10 and 28 together. See App.
Br. 10-15. Our decision turns on a limitation common to both, so we will
discuss claim 10 as being illustrative with key disputed limitations
emphasized.

                    10. A computer implemented method of
            managing annotations for a plurality of different
            type data objects, comprising:
                    receiving a set of parameters identifying an
            annotated data object, wherein the identifying
            parameters identify locations of the annotated data
            object;
                    *selecting, based on the set of identifying
            parameters, a mapping from a plurality of
            mappings, each containing a different set of
            mapping functions*; and

> *creating an index for the annotated data*
> *object by mapping the identifying parameters to*
> *columns in an index table, as specified by the*
> *mapping functions of the selected mapping,*
> wherein the mapping functions for each
> mapping are designed to map a different set of
> identifying parameters to columns in the index
> table,
> wherein the mapping functions of at least
> one of the mappings maps more than one
> identifying parameter to a single column.

The Examiner relies on the following as evidence of unpatentability:

Dobrowski	US 7,152,072 B2	Dec. 19, 2006
Chatterjee	US 7,162,691 B1	Jan. 9, 2007

THE REJECTION

Claims 10, 13, 14, 22, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chatterjeein view of Dobrowski. Ans.

3-8.[1]

ANALYSIS

The Examiner relies upon Chatterjee as teaching or at least suggesting

all of the claim limitations of claim 10 except for "wherein the mapping

functions of at least one of the mappings maps more than one identifying

---

[1] Throughout this opinion, we refer to the Appeal Brief filed June 15, 2009
(hereafter "App. Br."), the Examiner's Answer mailed Sep. 18, 2009
(hereafter "Ans."), and the Reply Brief filed Nov. 18, 2009 (hereafter "Reply
Br.").

parameter to a single column." App. Br. 4. The Examiner relies on
Dobrowski for teaching this limitation. Ans. 4 (citing Dobrowski's Fig. 4
and Col. 8 lines 44-47).

Appellants argue that the combined teachings of Chatterjee and
Dobrowski do not teach, show or suggest "selecting based on the set of
identifying parameters. a mapping from a plurality of mappings, each
containing a different set of mapping functions" and also do not teach
"creating an index for the annotated data object by mapping the identifying
parameters to columns in an index table, as specified by the mapping
functions of the selected mapping." App. Br. 10-11.

We agree with Examiner's findings to a point. For example, we agree
that Chatterjee teaches utilizing a particular selected mapping from among
various possible mappings for extracting metadata describing referenced
multimedia data. *See* steps 38 and 40 in Chatterjee's Fig. 2; *see also* col. 5,
ll. 30-38, col. 6, ll. 27-35. We also agree that the extracted metadata
ultimately becomes indexed. *See* step 50 in Chatterjee's Fig. 2. However,
we part company with the Examiner with regard to how the indexing takes
place. In particular, we find that the claim limitation: "creating an index for
the annotated data object by mapping the identifying parameters to columns
in an index table, as specified by the mapping functions of the selected
mapping" is not taught or suggested.

Appellants argued that the passages of Chatterjee cited by the
Examiner do not disclose an index being created "for the annotated data
object by mapping the identifying parameters to columns in an index table"
Ans. 11. Chatterjee extracts data from a web page to be used as metadata. It
then injects this metadata into a copy of the web page so that when that web

page is indexed (in a conventional manner) the metadata is indexed along with all other text in the web page. *See* Chatterjee, Col 1, lines 60-64 ("These annotations are inserted into a copy of the original Web page which contained the references to the media data and the resulting annotated Web page is then indexed using conventional text-based indexing and search engines."); *see also* col. 8, l. 10-12. Thus, Chatterjee utilizes mapping, but is silent as to the manner of indexing, including that required by claim 10. That is, it does not teach or suggest mapping particular parameters describing a web page to columns of an index table.

The Examiner finds that Chatterjee's extracted metadata itself *must* be stored in the index. Ans. 10-11. We agree. However the indexing that occurs is the "conventional" indexing described at col. 1, lines 60-64. There is no description in Chatterjee of index tables and mapping parameters to particular columns of an index table. Nor has the Examiner adequately demonstrated that such conventional indexing includes such a mapping. We therefore find that the Examiner has not provided sufficient evidence on the record that Chatterjee teaches or suggests <u>creating an index for the annotated data object by mapping the identifying parameters to columns in an index table, as specified by the mapping functions of the selected mapping</u>.

The portions of Dobrowski cited by the Examiner do not help in this regard. Dobrowski's Fig. 4, cited by the Examiner (Ans. 4), is an exemplary template for assisting a user in selecting parameters to be utilized to index items in a catalog-type database. The columns depicted in Fig. 4 are not columns of an index table. Rather they represent only a convenient set of windows for displaying parameter information. It appears that the

parameters are being selected to be mapped to fields of a database. They are not themselves being mapped to various portions of an index entry.

Although we do not adopt all of Appellants' reasoning, we do agree with the Appellants that Chatterjee does not teach the recitation to create an index by mapping parameters to columns of an index table. We are therefore persuaded that the Examiner erred in rejecting representative claim 10. Claim 28 includes the same operative features discussed above and therefore the analysis above applies as well to claim 28. Claims 13, 14, and 22 depend from claim 10 and will also not be sustained for the above-noted reasons.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner erred in rejecting claims 10, 13, 14, 22, and 28 under § 103 based on Chatterjee and Dobrowski.

ORDER

The Examiner's decision rejecting claims 10, 13, 14, 22, and 28 is reversed.

REVERSED

gvw